

The M(atric) model/ adS_2 correspondence*

P.K. Townsend

*DAMTP, University of Cambridge,
Silver Street, Cambridge CB3 9EW, UK.*

Abstract

The M(atric) model has a dual realization as IIA superstring theory in the near-horizon geometry of the supergravity D0-brane. The role of adS_2 in this correspondence is reviewed and some aspects of holography that it suggests are discussed.

*To appear in proceedings of the Third Puri Workshop on Quantum Field Theory, Quantum Gravity and Strings, Puri, Orissa, India, 9-19 December 1998.

The dynamics of n D0-branes of IIA superstring theory at an energy scale E is described, in the limit

$$\sqrt{\alpha'}E \rightarrow 0, \quad g_s \rightarrow 0, \quad (1)$$

by a *non-relativistic* $U(n)$ supersymmetric gauge quantum mechanics with 16 supersymmetries, otherwise known as the M(atrix) model [1]. Here, α' is the inverse string tension and g_s is the string coupling constant. The M(atrix) model is just a D=10 super-Yang-Mills (SYM) theory dimensionally reduced to D=1. The (dimensionful) coupling constant of this SYM theory is

$$g_{YM} = g_s^{1/2}(\alpha')^{-3/4}. \quad (2)$$

The group of symmetries of the M(atrix) model (excluding supersymmetries) is the D=10 Bargmann group, which is a central extension of the Galilean group; the central charge is the D0-brane mass. This group is a subgroup of the D=11 Poincaré group for which a null component of the 11-momentum is central. The (super)Bargmann invariance of the $U(1)$ theory follows from the fact that the action is the null reduction of the action for the D=11 massless superparticle [2]; the extension to $U(n)$ then follows from the fact that the relative D0-brane coordinates of translation and boost invariant. We conclude that the non-relativistic limit described above is equivalent to a limit in which the spacelike circle of S^1 compactified M-theory becomes lightlike. It has been argued that all degrees of freedom of IIA superstring theory other than D0-branes decouple in this limit [3], so that the M(atrix) model provides a definition of M-theory on a lightlike circle, as originally conjectured [1, 4].

According to the M(atrix) model, the UV regime of D=11 supergravity is described by the IR dynamics of the SYM theory. But the IR limit of the gauge theory is its strong coupling limit. This can be investigated in the limit of large n by 't Hooft's topological expansion [5], for which the effective dimensionless coupling constant at the energy scale E is

$$g_{eff}(E) = \frac{g_{YM}N^{1/2}}{E^{3/2}}. \quad (3)$$

The topological expansion is an asymptotic expansion in g_{eff} . According to a generalization of the *adS/CFT* correspondence [6, 7], the dual asymptotic expansion in g_{eff}^{-1} is provided by IIA supergravity in the background of its D0-brane solution [8]. In the *string*

frame the non-vanishing fields of this solution are

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{st}^2 &= -H^{-\frac{1}{2}} dt^2 + H^{\frac{1}{2}} ds^2(\mathbb{E}^9) \\ e^\phi &= g_s H^{\frac{3}{4}} \\ \tilde{F}_8 &= g_s^{-1} \star_9 dH \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\tilde{F}_8$ is the 8-form dual of the 2-form Ramond-Ramond (RR) field strength, $\star_9$ is the Hodge dual on $\mathbb{E}^9$, and H is a harmonic function on $\mathbb{E}^9$. The g_s -dependence may be determined from the solution with $g_s = 1$ by means of the transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &\rightarrow \phi + \lambda \\ \tilde{F}_8 &\rightarrow e^{-\lambda} \tilde{F}_8 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where λ is a constant. This is not an invariance of the action but it is an invariance of the field equations.

In coordinates such that

$$ds^2(\mathbb{E}^9) = dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_8^2, \tag{6}$$

where $d\Omega_8^2$ is the $SO(9)$ -invariant metric on S^8 , we may choose the harmonic function H to be

$$H = 1 + g_s N \left(\frac{\sqrt{\alpha'}}{r} \right)^7. \tag{7}$$

Given the factor of g_s^{-1} in $\tilde{F}_8$, this choice corresponds to N coincident D0-branes at the origin of $\mathbb{E}^9$. We can now rewrite H as

$$H = 1 + \frac{g_{eff}^2(U)}{(\sqrt{\alpha'} U)^4} \tag{8}$$

where

$$U = r/\alpha'. \tag{9}$$

The variable U has dimensions of energy. It is the energy of a string of length r , although one should not read too much into this fact as U will shortly be seen to be merely a convenient intermediate variable. For the moment we need only suppose (subject to later verification) that ‘low energy’ corresponds to the limit $\sqrt{\alpha'} U \rightarrow 0$. For any non-zero g_{YM} this implies $g_{eff}(U) \rightarrow \infty$, which we need in any case for the validity of the dual IIA

supergravity description of the D0-brane dynamics. The low-energy limit is therefore a ‘near-horizon’ limit in the sense that

$$H \rightarrow \frac{g_{eff}^2(U)}{(\sqrt{\alpha'}U)^4}. \quad (10)$$

There is a problem with this limit, however, because the string frame metric of (4) has a curvature singularity at singularities of H , i.e. at $U = 0$.

Although the string frame is natural in the context of IIA superstring theory, it is not obviously the preferred frame in the context of the M(atric) model. Of course, no frame is really ‘preferred’ because the physics cannot depend on the choice of frame, but there may be a frame in which the physics is simplest. It was argued in [7] that the preferred frame in this sense is the ‘dual’ frame, defined for a general p-brane (up to homothety) as the one for which the dual brane (the D6-brane in our case) has a tension independent of the dilaton. In this frame, and for all $p \neq 5$, the singularities of the harmonic function H in the p-brane metric are Killing horizons near which the D-dimensional geometry is $adS_{p+2} \times S^{D-p-2}$ [9, 10]. This result generalizes the interpolation property of p-branes, such as the M2, M5 and D3 branes, that do not couple to a dilaton [11]. For the D0-brane the dual frame metric $d\tilde{s}^2$ is related to the string frame metric as follows:

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = (e^\phi N)^{-\frac{2}{7}} ds_{st}^2. \quad (11)$$

The factor of N is included here for later convenience. The D0-brane metric is now

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = (g_s N)^{-\frac{2}{7}} \left[-H^{-\frac{5}{7}} dt^2 + H^{\frac{2}{7}} (dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_8^2) \right], \quad (12)$$

and in the near-horizon limit we have

$$d\tilde{s}^2 \sim \alpha' \left[- \left(g_{YM}^2 N \right)^{-1} U^5 dt^2 + U^{-2} dU^2 + d\Omega_8^2 \right]. \quad (13)$$

The singularity of the metric at $U = 0$ is now only a coordinate singularity at a Killing horizon of ∂_U , but the metric still depends on the SYM coupling constant. To circumvent this, we define the a new radial variable u (with dimensions of energy) by

$$u^2 = \frac{U^5}{g_{YM}^2 N}. \quad (14)$$

For convenience we also introduce the rescaled time coordinate

$$\tilde{t} = \frac{5}{2} t. \quad (15)$$

The near-horizon D0-brane solution is now [7]

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha')^{-1} d\tilde{s}^2 &= \frac{4}{25} \left[-u^2 d\tilde{t}^2 + u^{-2} du^2 \right] + d\Omega_8^2 \\ e^\phi &= N^{-1} [g_{eff}(u)]^{7/5} \\ \tilde{F}_8 &= 7N \text{vol}(S^8) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We recognise this as $adS_2 \times S^8$, with standard (horospherical) coordinates for the adS_2 factor. As u is now the only dimensionful variable it sets the energy scale for solutions of the massless wave equation in the near-horizon geometry. This fact implies that an infra-red cut-off of supergravity at length $\alpha' u$ corresponds, via holography [12], to an ultraviolet cut-off of the D0-brane SYM theory at energy u [13].

The adS_2 metric has an $SL(2; R)$ isometry group. This does not extend to a symmetry of the full near-horizon solution because the dilaton field is invariant only under the one-dimensional subgroup generated by ∂_t . However, scale transformations generated by the Killing vector field $t\partial_t - u\partial_u$ take one hypersurface of constant u into another such hypersurface, which leads to a rescaling of $g_{eff}(u)$. A hypersurface of constant u is thus the vacuum of the M(atric) model at coupling $g_{eff}(u)$. As we rescale u we go either to a free theory with $g_{eff} = 0$ at the adS_2 boundary, which is obviously scale invariant, or towards a strongly coupled theory at the Killing horizon of ∂_t at $u = 0$. In order to keep e^ϕ small in the latter limit we must take N large. However, for any finite N the effective string coupling constant will still become large sufficiently near $u = 0$ and the IIA supergravity description will break down. This is an indication that we should pass to D=11 supergravity.

Given that the full D0-brane solution (4) is the reduction of the M-wave, one might wonder what the near-horizon limit of the D0-brane solution lifts to in D=11. In view of the fact that the non-relativistic D0-brane action is the null reduction of the D=11 massless superparticle action, the obvious guess is that the near-horizon limit of the D0-brane solution is a null reduction of the M-wave. This is true, in the following sense [14].

The M-wave metric is

$$ds_{11}^2 = dudv + Kdu^2 + ds^2(\mathbb{E}^9) \quad (17)$$

where K is harmonic on $\mathbb{E}^9$; it is also an arbitrary function of u but in order to reduce to D=10 we must choose it to be u -independent. The choice $K = Q/r^7$ where r is the distance from the origin in $\mathbb{E}^9$ now leads to the D0-brane solution (4) after reduction along orbits of the timelike Killing vector field $\partial_u - \partial_v$. This is the standard timelike reduction. We may instead reduce along orbits of the Killing vector field ∂_u , which is null at spatial infinity. To this end we set $v = 2t$ and write (17) as

$$ds_{11}^2 = K(du + K^{-1}dt)^2 + K^{-1/2}ds_{st}^2 \quad (18)$$

where

$$ds_{st}^2 = -K^{-\frac{1}{2}}dt^2 + K^{\frac{1}{2}}ds^2(\mathbb{E}^9). \quad (19)$$

is the string frame 10-metric. The IIA solution resulting from reduction on orbits of ∂_u is therefore the D0-brane solution in the near-horizon limit, i.e. with H replaced by $K = H - 1$.

It is satisfying that the dual supergravity description of n D0-branes for large n is a wave solution because this is what one would expect from the Bohr correspondence principle. However, we have still to consider what happens at $u = 0$. In many cases, singularities of IIA solutions are resolved by their D=11 interpretation [15], but this does not happen here. The singularities of the harmonic function K are curvature singularities of the M-wave solution, so the D=11 supergravity description must break down there. The reason that the IIA supergravity dual description breaks down is that the effective string coupling becomes large. While this implies a decompactification to D=11 it also implies that the neglect of string loop corrections, and hence M-theory corrections in D=11, cannot be ignored. These are UV corrections to D=11 supergravity that should be determined by the IR physics of the M(atrrix) model, but this is its strong coupling limit that we hoped to understand via its supergravity dual.

Although we have failed to learn much about the IR physics of the M(atrrix) model from its supergravity dual, we can presumably learn how to resolve the singularity of the M-wave solution of D=11 supergravity from the IR physics of the M(atrrix) model; it is

just that the M(atrix) model/ adS_2 correspondence doesn't help us to accomplish this. On the positive side, it does show that the M(atrix) model proposal is a close cousin of Maldacena's adS/CFT proposal [16] (as argued by other means in [17, 18]). The latter is generally considered to provide an illustration of the concept of holography [19]. If this is extended to the M(atrix) model [20] and, more generally, to other branes then the general statement would seem to be that the bulk gravitational physics is determined by the physics of the 'matter' on branes. M-theory provides a natural realization of this idea (which is also suggested by the global nature of observables in general relativistic theories) because the uniqueness of D=11 supergravity ensures the absence of bulk matter.

This is all rather similar to Mach's principle, as Hořava has previously pointed out in the context of an alternative proposal for the degrees of freedom of M-theory [21]. The utility of Mach's principle is rather limited for asymptotically flat spacetimes because the local inertial frames are then predominantly determined by the existence of asymptopia. Holography is similarly limited; its applicability to adS spacetimes is evidently linked to the fact that timelike spatial infinity can be interpreted as a brane. This limitation would not be a problem if the universe were spatially closed, but this invokes cosmology to resolve an apparently unrelated problem. Perhaps this is an indication that they are not unrelated and that a consistent nonperturbative formulation of quantum gravity must incorporate cosmology.

Acknowledgements: This article is largely an elaboration for $p = 0$ of work reported for general p in [7]. I thank my collaborators HarmJan Boonstra and Kostas Skenderis, and also Gary Gibbons and Arkady Tseytlin for discussions on related issues. I thank Mohab Abou-Zeid, Melanie Becker, Iouri Chepelev and Petr Hořava for helpful comments on an earlier version, and the organisers of the 3'rd Puri workshop for the opportunity to visit India.

References

- [1] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S.H. Shenker and L. Susskind, *M-theory as a matrix model: a conjecture*, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 5112.

- [2] E. Bergshoeff and P.K. Townsend, *Super D-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B490** (1997) 145.
- [3] N. Seiberg, *Why is the Matrix theory correct?*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 3577;
A. Sen, *D0-branes on T^n and Matrix theory*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 51.
- [4] L. Susskind, *Another conjecture about M(atrix) theory*, hep-th/9704080.
- [5] G. 't Hooft, *A planar diagram theory for strong interactions*, Nucl. Phys. **B72** (1974) 461.
- [6] N. Itzhaki, J. Maldacena, J. Sonnenschein and S. Yankielowicz, *Supergravity and the large N limit of theories with 16 supersymmetries*, Phys. Rev. **D58** (1988) 046004.
- [7] H.J. Boonstra, K. Skenderis and P.K. Townsend, *The domain-wall/QFT correspondence*, JHEP 9901 (1999) 003.
- [8] G. Horowitz and A. Strominger, *Black strings and p-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B360** (1991) 197.
- [9] M.J. Duff, G.W. Gibbons and P.K. Townsend, *Macroscopic superstrings as interpolating solitons*, Phys. Lett. **332 B** (1994) 321.
- [10] H.J. Boonstra, B. Peeters and K. Skenderis, *Duality and asymptotic geometries*, Phys. Lett. **411B** (1997) 59; *Brane intersections, anti-de Sitter Spacetimes and Dual Superconformal Theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B411** (1997) 59.
- [11] G.W. Gibbons and P.K. Townsend, *Vacuum interpolation in supergravity via super p-branes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993) 3754.
- [12] E. Witten and L. Susskind, *The holographic bound in anti-de-Sitter space*, hep-th/9805114.
- [13] A.W. Peet and J. Polchinski, *UV/IR relations in AdS dynamics*, hep-th/9809022.
- [14] K. Becker, M. Becker, J. Polchinski and A. Tseytlin, *Higher order graviton scattering in M(atrix) theory*, Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 3174.

- [15] P.K. Townsend, *The eleven-dimensional supermembrane revisited*, Phys. Lett. **350B**, (1995) 184.
- [16] J. Maldacena, *The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 231.
- [17] M. Li, E. Martinec and V. Sahakian, *Black Holes and the SYM phase diagram*, Phys. Rev. **D59** (1999) 044035;
E. Martinec and V. Sahakian, *Black Holes and the SYM phase diagram: II*, hep-th/9810224.
- [18] I. Chepelev, *Are M-atrrix theory and Maldacena's conjecture related?*, hep-th/9901033.
- [19] G. 't Hooft, *Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity*, gr-qc/9310026;
L. Susskind, *The world as a hologram*, J. Math. Phys. **36** (1995) 6377.
- [20] L. Susskind, *Holography in the flat space limit*, hep-th/9901079.
- [21] P. Hořava, *M-theory as a holographic field theory*, hep-th/9712130.